UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,485	04/19/2004	Makarand P. Gore	200315628-1	3286
22879 7590 08/30/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			EXAMINER	
			HOFFER, SUSANNA MARIE	
	TUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION LINS, CO 80527-2400 ART UNIT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2, 00 0001 1700		1609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/827,485	GORE, MAKARAND P.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susanna Hoffer	1609	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	nddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (36(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONO, cause the application to become AE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 A	<u>pril 2004</u> .		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the	ne merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		·	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 (CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form P	PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in A	pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been	received in this Nationa	l Stage
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application	•

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-18 and 45-46, drawn to a jettable solution, classified in class 424, subclass 400.
- II. Claims 19-28, drawn to a method for forming a jettable microemulsion, classified in class 424, subclass 400.
- III. Claims 29-32, drawn to a method for forming a jettable microemulsion, classified in class 424, subclass 400.
- IV. Claims 33-39, drawn to a method for forming an oral medication, classified in class 424, subclass 439.
- V. Claims 40-44 and 47-49, drawn to a system for dispensing an oral medication, classified in class 424, subclass 439.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and Inventions II, III, and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as first

Art Unit: 1609

combining the pharmaceutical with the oil and then adding an aqueous solution to form a microemulsion or combining the pharmaceutical with a microemulsion that has already been prepared.

Inventions II and III and Invention IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the dispenser can be used for a different kind of microemulsion. The subcombination has separate utility such as a microemulsion that is encapsulated.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Art Unit: 1609

Inventions II and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are not capable of use together. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the jettable solution can be encapsulated.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/827,485 Page 5

Art Unit: 1609

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1609

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna Hoffer whose telephone number is (571)272-9345. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on (571)272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1609

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMH

MICHAEL MELLER PRIMARY EXAMINER